

respectfully requested based upon the following distinctions between the claimed invention and the teachings and disclosure of Mizutani et al. '204.

Mizutani et al. '204 discloses a magneto-optical recording apparatus which performs an efficient writing operation in the overwriting manner. Information is written on one of the first and second storage layers 16, 20 of a disc while the other storage layer is cleared using two laser beams. When another batch of information is written, the information is written on the previously cleared storage layer while the previously recorded storage layer is cleared using the two laser beams. Hence, a writing operation on the apparatus does not require a time for an erasing operation prior to initiating a writing operation. See col. 10, line 3 - col. 11, line 6. In reading the recorded information from the disc, the first and second storage layers 16 and 20 are irradiated by respective laser beams having different wavelengths. See col. 11, lines 7 - 25.

From the recording and reading principle of Mizutani, it is noted that Mizutani's method is completely different from the inventive method in independent claim 24. Mizutani does not disclose or suggest the first feature of irradiating magnetic layers with light beam having wavelength λ_1 to reproduce first

information recorded on the first magnetic layer and storing the first information reproduced from the first magnetic layer, and the second feature of irradiating the magnetic layers with a light beam having wavelength $\lambda_2 \neq \lambda_1$ to heat to a recording temperature of the recording layers while applying a magnetic field.

With respect to independent claim 38, Mitutani does not disclose or suggest the first feature of irradiating a rewritable recording media with a light beam having wavelength λ_1 to reproduce information recorded on the media and irradiating the rewritable recording media with a light beam having wavelength λ_2 ($\lambda_2 \neq \lambda_1$) to record information onto the media, and the second feature in which the light beams of wavelengths λ_1 and λ_2 are irradiated at different positions from each other on the media.

Based upon the above considerations and the fact that each of Applicants' dependent claims depend from either claim 24 or 38, it is clear that the Mizutani et al. '204 reference is incapable of anticipating any of Applicants' pending claims.

The cited Mizutani et al. '204 reference is also incapable of rendering obvious any of Applicants' pending claims. In this respect, no motivation is provided anywhere in the cited

reference for arriving at a method for recording and reproduction as are cited in the instant claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's courtesy in indicating that claims 34 and 37 are allowable except for being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Even so, claims 34 and 37 have not been amended herein since Applicants contend that all of the pending claims, including independent base claims 24 and 38, are allowable at present.

Conclusion


Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the present response, he is respectfully requested to direct these to Mr. John W. Bailey (Reg. No. 32,881) at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

Appl. No. 09/321,795

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
John W. Bailey, #32,881

kja
2282-0127P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000